

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Applicants acknowledge, with thanks, the courtesy of the Examiner and his Supervisor for granting a telephone interview.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 11, 15 and 20-23 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1, 7, 11 and 22-23 have been amended and claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-19 and 24-25 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 4, 7, 11, 15 and 20-23 are presented for reconsideration.

Claims 1 and 7 were generally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over Johnson et al., Frelechoux and Stracke at page 2, lines 6-8 of the Office Action. Claims 1 and 7, however, were specifically rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over Johnson et al., O'Riordan and Stracke at pages 2-5 of the Office Action. Applicants assume, therefore, that the general reference to Frelechoux was a clerical error and that claims 1 and 7 are rejected over Johnson et al., O'Riordan and Stracke.

During the interview, the Examiner agreed that amended claim 1 includes features which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record, but a new search would be conducted upon filing of this Amendment. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the art of record.

Claim 7, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claim 7 is also allowable over the art of record for at least reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Claims 4, 11, 15 and 20-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over the combination of Johnson et al., O'Riordan, Stracke and Jensen. Applicants again assume the general reference to Frelechoux on page 6 of the Office Action is a clerical error. Jensen is cited for teaching a system wherein the virtual router information includes a virtual router identifier, a virtual IP address and a virtual MAC address. Jensen, however, does not make up for the deficiencies of Johnson et al., O'Riordan, Stracke, as described above with respect to claim 1. The rejection of claims 24-25 are moot due to the cancellation of these claims. Claims 4 and 20-21 depend from claim 1 and claims 11, 15 and 22-23 depend from claim 7. Accordingly, claims 4, 11, 15 and 20-23 are also allowable.

Application No.: 10/531,888  
Amendment Dated April 15, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of January 15, 2009

MAT-8683US

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, Applicants submit the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  

---

Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738  
Attorney for Applicants

JLE/DFD/nm

Dated: April 15, 2009

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

NM396085